REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-51 are pending. Claims 1-51 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 22 and 37 have been amended. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 22 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"). The Examiner stated that

As per claim 1, AAPA teaches a computer implemented method of building at least one data display which comprises: defining for each data display at least one of an information presence on the display, the information presence comprising a plurality of informational sets, each information set corresponding to one or more of the at least one data displays, each information set having a corresponding placement (Specification, page 2, lines 2-4; e.g. Set #1 comprising of pars A/B, and Set #2 comprising of parts A/B/C, with a corresponding formatted display presentation)

(p. 2-3, Office Action 020805)

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by AAPA under 35 U.S.C. 102§(e). Amended claim 1 includes the following limitations:

A computer implemented method of building at least one data display comprises: defining, through an interactive process, for each data display at least one of an information presence on the display, the information presence comprising a plurality of information sets, each information set corresponding to one or more of the at least one data displays, each information set having a corresponding placement, and an information placement on the display, the information placement specifying one or more new positions for at least a portion of one or more of the information sets; defining a data-base entity having each of the defined information placement,

and information presence; and
in response to a user request, dynamically generating a multi-informational display template for the at least one data displays based upon the data-base entity.

(Amended claim 1) (emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has mischaracterized the AAPA. The portion of the specification cited by the Examiner as disclosing the limitation of an information presence on the display, the information presence comprising a plurality of information sets, each information set corresponding to one or more of the at least one data displays, each information set having a corresponding placement does not describe such as prior art. Rather the specification states that different users may have different requirements in regard to the display of information. The specification does not indicate that such requirements have ever been fulfilled by an extant system.

The root of the confusion may lie at page 2, line 14, of the specification:

"Conventional database systems and methods include display templates that define specific database information to be displayed, and a placement of the information for a specific browser characteristics". (sic)

A thorough reading of the specification shows that this portion of the AAPA does not disclose the limitation at issue. Moreover, the specification goes on to specifically state that

"However, these templates do not respond to dynamic user requests ..." (Specification, Pg. 2, lines 16 - 17)

Applicants have amended the claims to include the limitation of dynamically generating a display in response to a user request. For these reasons applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 22, and 37 are not anticipated by AAPA. Given that claims 2-21, claims 23-36, and claims 38-51, depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 22, and 37, respectively, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-21, claims 23-36, and claims 38-51, are, likewise, not anticipated by AAPA.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-21, 23-36, 38-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,684,369 of Bernardo et al. ("Bernardo").

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-21, 23-36 and 38-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Bernardo. The Examiner has stated that

As per claim 2-21, while AAPA inherently teaches the step of generating/building display templates, AAPA does not explicitly disclose how a display template is created/built. Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art that an actual end product, after being defined and saved as a template, could be used as a future template. For instance, a form containing commonly used information could be created, retrieved later and used as a template for another situation with minimal changes to it; after the changes, it could be saved separately from the template form which its is created from. A web page could be an example of such a form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include such a method for creating a template with AAPA in order to easily and efficiently create a display template.

(p. 4, Office Action 020805)

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the claims as amended are not rendered obvious by either of AAPA or Bernado, alone or in combination.

Bernado fails to remedy the deficiency of AAPA even as characterized by the Examiner in that, neither AAPA nor Bernado disclose the limitation of dynamically generating a display in response to a user request. Nor does AAPA alone or in combination with Bernado render such limitation obvious.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5/2/05

Tom Van Zano

Reg. No. 43,219

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, California 90025 (408) 720-8300